

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

24th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIV, No. 20

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© December 15, 1994

## Name Reshuffle Creates House Science Committee

For the old science establishment, awaiting the arrival of the Gingrich Wrecking Co., the little bit of good news around Washington last week concerned the title of a committee in the House of Representatives.

The House Science, Space, and Technology Committee was en route to being rechristened with a horrific moniker: the Technology and Competitiveness Committee—T&C, for short, *sans* Science or Space. But then, a sudden turnabout occurred, and the committee emerged from the Gingrich reorganization with yet another and, presumably, firm name: the Committee on Science, which sounds good for science, even if, in fact, it means nothing.

Small as it was, the name-change news was gratefully received in science-policy ranks, thus providing a measure of the apprehension and dismay prevailing in the capital-based outposts of research and higher education. The space estab-

## Republican Senators Vote to Kill Office of Tech. Assessment—P. 4

lishment, never especially close to the committee, seemed indifferent. Not so the scientists, who are most pleased by abundant budgets, but also care greatly about symbolic and ceremonial recognition.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee, chaired for the past four years by science's gruff but warm friend, Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), has long served as the home on the Hill for the capital's science crowd. Created in response to Sputnik in 1959, and originally called the Science and Technology Committee, the presentday version possesses a seemingly powerful law-writing jurisdiction for NSF, NASA, NIST, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and several odds and ends.

But in the politics of the House, the powers of the committee are puny, as evidenced by the hordes of freshmen members who apply to join the committee then drop off in disappointment. NASA and other big technology have concentrated on developing ties elsewhere in Congress, leaving politically colorless academic science as the most importuning and grateful client of the committee. Amply staffed and dedicated to promoting science, the committee has evolved into the leading showcase for the anxieties and aspirations of the mandarins of science.

As the victorious Republicans gathered in Washington over the past two weeks to organize their takeover of Congress, the impending name change to Technology and Com-

(Continued on Page 3)

## An Odd Heap of R&D Views From the New Chairman

The incoming Chairman of the newly rechristened House Science Committee, Rep. Robert Walker, of Pennsylvania, describes himself as a science enthusiast, and says he's concerned that the National Science Foundation has strayed from its mission to support basic research.

He also thinks government should use science and technology "to invent ourselves" out of crises.

His ideas are an ideological hash on the role of government in science and technology and their application. By and large Walker conveys the impression that he's a gung-ho fan of S&T, but with reservations about the proper government role, and dreamy expectations about tax incentives increasing private-sector support for research.

He says he's against President Clinton's programs for

(Continued on Page 2)

## In Brief

Federal technology and education programs threatened by budget whacking will be shifted as much as possible to where the money is, the Defense and Energy Departments, a senior White House official tells SGR. Even before election day, the two Departments were moving into territory distant from their traditional missions. DOE recently announced awards totaling \$1 million for children's programs at seven science museums. At DOD, where things are on a grander scale, nearly \$500 million will be spent this year on "dual-use" technologies, suitable for civilian and military applications.

*Reports that DOE may be cut back substantially or even abolished in a wave of spending cuts stirred a protest last week at a Washington press conference by a coalition consisting of the Alliance to Save Energy, the Safe Energy Communication Council, the Military Production Network, and the Union of Concerned Scientists. Their concerns ranged from loss of civilian control over nuclear weapons production to cuts in nuclear-waste clean-up and renewable energy research. For information: Safe Energy Communication Council, 1717 Mass. Ave. NW, Suite 805, attn. Mary Myers, Wash., DC 20036; tel. 202/483-8491; fax 202/234-9194.*

Identification of job opportunities outside traditional tracks for mathematicians is the goal of a \$350,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to the American Mathematical Society and the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics. Math has been hard hit by joblessness, with the latest unemployment for advanced-degree holders reported at 12 percent. Heading the project are Samuel Rankin, AMS Associate Executive Director, and James Crowley, SIAM Executive Director.

## ... Fellow "Techno-nuts"—Clinton, Gingrich, Walker

(Continued from Page 1)

boosting commercial technology, but is otherwise undecided about his Republican party mates' recommendations for throttling several research agencies and programs.

Regarding a vote by Senate Republicans to terminate the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, Walker describes himself as having "an open mind," adding that "they have done some valuable work," but that "probably they need to be restructured" to "be more in line" with the legislative cycle—an apparent reference to OTA's scholarly pace. On the Space Station, he says he remains "an enthusiast." He remains opposed to the academic pork barrel, and will seek a cutoff of federal funds for universities that partake of it.

"I believe in university-based research," Walker says, suggesting that "more and more government science centers" should be "moving toward a university association" akin to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory's ties to Caltech. NASA is a prime candidate for further expansion in that direction, he adds. And he thinks industrial research in low orbit would boom if entrepreneurs were granted a 10-year tax moratorium from profits derived from such work.

Walker says he's anxious to work with Bill Clinton—who, "like Newt Gingrich and me, is a kind of techno-nut."

The incoming Chairman is enthusiastic, even euphoric, about the potential of hydrogen as a fuel for general use. A bill that he sponsored for hydrogen research was passed by the House this year, but never made it through the Senate. He says he'll try again. He's also still in favor of another stymied proposal he made, creation of a cabinet-level department that would encompass science, space, energy, and technology.

The sayings of Chairman Walker, dispensed on December 14 at a press briefing in a Science Committee hearing room, constitute the first extensive post-election discussion of science-related matters by a senior Republican member of Congress.

The Science Committee is far from being a powerhouse in federal science affairs, since it lacks jurisdiction over defense, health, and agricultural research, which account for some 70-75 percent of Washington's R&D spending. But it has become the major stage for science-policy discussions in Congress. It writes the laws for NASA, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. And in the next Congress, it will acquire jurisdiction over R&D in the Department of Energy. Furthermore, Chairman Walker will also be Vice Chairman of the House Budget Committee, which has a great deal of influence over spending levels and budget policy. Perhaps most important, Walker is close to Gingrich, a self-proclaimed "futurist" and space enthusiast who has expressed a strong interest in science.

With the big hearing room crowded with reporters, lobbyists, committee staff, and others drawn by the debut of the incoming Chairman, Walker briefly described the re-

vamping of the committee, from five to four subcommittees, with Investigations and Oversight lopped off. Its responsibilities, he said, will belong to all subcommittees. The new subcommittees, for which chairmen will soon be named, are Space and Aeronautics; Basic Research; Energy and Environment; and Technology. Perhaps of symbolic significance, Basic Research will take over from what was just plain Science under the old regime.

Walker spoke warmly of the departing Chairman, Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), who will head the Science Committee's minority in the next Congress. Walker said he expects to work closely with Brown in "the best interests of science for the country." Brown, who chaired the committee for four years and was toasted by the scientific community as a statesman of science, sat glumly in the rear of the hearing room. As all Capitol Hill hands know very well, glory goes with position, and now the invitations will be addressed to Chairman Walker.

Sketching his strategy for committee operations, Walker said, "The full committee is going to be used largely as a place where we are going to do hearings related to the future. I'd like to see us spend a lot of time at the full committee bringing in a series of witnesses that will talk, not in terms of the day-to-day work of the committee, but rather will help us focus on the future. So that as we determine priorities, our science priorities will reflect where the experts in our fields see us going in the next century."

The first hearings, perhaps early in January, he said, "will involve testimony from all relevant cabinet members who have jurisdictions in our areas." Walker said they will be asked not about their next budget, but "what their agencies and departments should be doing to prepare us for the new economy and the new culture" of the next century.

His soon-to-be-reintroduced Hydrogen Research Bill, Walker said, is part of his effort to demonstrate that "there are ways of developing new technologies that can provide us with clean, efficient fuels for the future that would get us out from underneath a huge regulatory burden. If, in fact, there are ways to invent ourselves out of the crises that we face, then government ought to be actively involved in those kinds of discoveries and inventions."

(Continued on Page 3)

### © 1994, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher  
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher  
Wanda J. Relf

Circulation Manager  
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$455.00 (two years, \$780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## ... Chairman Balked at "Tech and Competitiveness"

(Continued from Page 1)

petitiveness was widely reported. This was a puzzling choice of nomenclature, given Republican vows to dismantle the Clinton Administration's principle programs for linking technology and competitiveness. But the reports persisted, showed up in the Republicans' planning documents, and were carried in the press.

Perhaps it was that "T&C," as it quickly came to be called, was chosen because it conveyed the pro-business spirit of Gingrich and his ideological compatriots. Whatever the case, as recently as December 8, the *New York Times* and other mainstream publications reported Technology and Competitiveness as the new title for Brown's old committee. But by that date, though it was not widely known, the change had undergone a change. Three days earlier, when the Republicans met to elect their leaders for the next Congress, the only uncertainty in the upper echelons concerned the Majority Whip, two slots below Speaker in the House hierarchy.

Running hard for that job was Rep. Robert Walker, of Pennsylvania, 51, a former teacher, first elected to the House in 1976 after a decade as a Congressional staff assistant. A buddy of incoming Speaker Gingrich, Walker was considered a strong candidate for Whip. But just in case he didn't make it, the Republicans were holding open the Chairmanship of the committee that was soon to become T&C. As a member of T&C's predecessors since 1977, Walker was the ranking Republican on the committee, and thus first in seniority for Chairman in a Republican-controlled House.

Alas for Walker, his party colleagues rejected him for Whip in favor of Rep. Tom DeLay, of Texas. Whereupon Walker told Gingrich he'd take the chairmanship of his old committee, but with the strong hope that the Speaker-to-be would grant him a wish about the title. His preference, Walker explained, was for a simple title, the Committee on Science. Gingrich agreed, and Walker was designated Chairman-to-be in the next Congress.

Despite the truncated title, the Committee over which

Walker will preside will retain its present jurisdiction, and gain several castoffs from the committee reshuffling directed by Gingrich. Coming within the fold of the Science Committee will be the Department of Energy labs, sliced off from the present Energy and Commerce Committee, which becomes just the Commerce Committee. The Science Committee will also pick up some oceanographic items from the demolished Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

With Chairman Brown relishing the spotlight, Walker was a pale presence on the Committee. But, unlike many members, he took his duties there seriously, and generally cooperated with the Democratic majority. Along with his fellow Republicans, Walker parted with the majority on regulation and risk assessment, and he usually preferred spending less rather than more money. But on most matters, he and Brown worked together, including the campaign against earmarked appropriations, a heartfelt issue for Brown.

Among the science lobbyists, Walker's ascension to the chairmanship was positively received, and not merely by the measure of it could have been worse. One hope at this pregame stage of Republican House rule is that Walker will exercise a moderating influence on Gingrich's zest to tear down major segments of the federal establishment.

The "hit list" issued in September included such unthinkable eliminations as the venerable US Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, and big cuts in agricultural research and university overhead payments [SGR, November 15]. But already there are signs of resistance to the bloodthirsty spirit evidenced by the selection of these targets. Several Republican Senators, for example, have pointed out that the Contract With America, and its hit-list addenda, were produced by House Republicans and have not been endorsed on the other side of the Capitol.

Gingrich promises a rousing first 100 days after Congress returns, starting with a 12-hour session on opening day, January 4, dedicated to a running start toward implementing the House Republicans' Contract With America.

### Walker (Continued from Page 2)

The work of the committee, he continued, should "reflect that science has an intrinsic value in our society, but that in order to reflect that intrinsic value, it ought to be seen as an arbiter and a developer of new ideas. . . Real science is not something to be used to confirm a political agenda"—a reference to the scientific wars over environmental issues. Hearings will be held "early" on NASA's Mission to Planet Earth and on global warming.

In a question and answer period, Walker said he remains "very, very supportive of the core programs" of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, meaning the traditional standards-setting work that NIST carries on from its predecessor, the National Bureau of Standards. But, he added, he's "less enthusiastic" about NIST's commercially focused Advanced Technology Program, which he disparag-

ingly referred to as "the fount of national industrial programs." That money, he suggested, should be diverted to NIST's core programs.

Asked about the National Science Foundation's role in promoting economic growth, Walker said that "my own bias with regard to NSF is toward having NSF be essentially a basic-science agency, rather than an applied science agency. I believe that too much of NSF's money is getting diverted these days toward applied research, and I would like to see NSF be far more concentrated on being a basic-research type of agency, supporting basic research at the university level."

Among other points made by the new Chairman: fusion research has experienced serious cost over-runs that require a close look, he's aiming for multi-year authorization bills, and he expects to get along well with the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.—DSG

## Elimination of OTA Voted by Senate Republicans

One of the latest entries on the Republican hit list calls for the abolition of a pillar of policy research and analysis on Capitol Hill, the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a scholarly enclave with close ties to the scientific community.

Few if any complaints are ever heard about the quality of OTA's work. The agency, however, suffers from untimely political associations, the most prominent being Senator Edward Kennedy, the incarnation of all that's politically and personally abhorrent to the Republican right wing. Kennedy has been a member of OTA's Congressional Board since the agency was founded in 1972, and currently serves as Board Chairman. Also weighing on OTA is the appearance of a strong link to the Clinton White House in the person of the President's Science and Technology Advisor, John Gibbons, who headed OTA for 14 years.

Termination of OTA—not mere shrinkage—was endorsed by the Senate Republican Conference last week as part of a general reduction of the legislative branch. With a budget of \$21.9 million, a full-time staff of about 140, plus 70 temporary appointments, OTA is a piddling item in a Congressional budget of \$2.4 billion.

Its elimination, however, would signal that the Republican majorities know where they want to go legislatively and don't require scholarly guidance from an inhouse think tank founded by and long associated with Democrats. A total wipeout of a whole Congressional agency would also show that the Republicans are not merely talking about wholesale bureaucratic slaughter.

The ax cannot be wielded until Congress convenes next month and puts the issue to a vote. In the meantime, OTA's friends on Capitol Hill and beyond can be expected to fight for its survival in at least a scaled-down form—perhaps a 50 percent reduction, according to one fall-back scheme.

But the Republicans possess the votes and, at this point, the momentum to eliminate OTA as part of their politically appealing promise to cut down the size of the federal government, starting with Congress and its various support agencies. The incoming House Republicans haven't yet addressed OTA. But they're even fiercer than their Senate party mates in anti-government fervor, and OTA supporters see little possibility of help from that side of Congress.

Along with OTA, the Republican Senators also endorsed a 25 percent reduction for the General Accounting Office, which runs on \$450 million a year. The GAO conducts investigations for Congressional committees and can be useful for carrying out Republican promises to dig into the operations of the Clinton executive branch.

Getting off without any recommended cuts was the Congressional Research Service (CRS), in the Library of Congress. According to one Capitol Hill veteran, CRS is skilled in nuts-and-bolts legislative work, including bill drafting, and thus possesses skills that are in short supply among the incoming Republicans.

OTA, on the other hand, produces thick reports, often a year or two in preparation, that exhaustively examine policy issues on or approaching the Congressional agenda. They don't provide easy reading, but their value is widely accepted. Recent topics include proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, social implications of molecular biology research, international comparisons in health-care costs, and the technological roles of multinational firms in the US economy. Over 20 years, OTA has become part of the landscape on Capitol Hill. And despite Republican victory whoops and drastic budget-cutting vows, OTA was not considered to be in the line of fire.

Political complaints about OTA have been extremely rare in recent years. The most common lament about OTA's output is that it is turgid and overwhelming in size and detail, rather than ideologically tilted. Though Washington's leading product is printed pages, few of them actually get read in the madcap pace that dominates the capital's work life. Hence, skimpy "executive summaries" of a few pages are standard features in official literature.

But since even these can be too much, OTA, and Washington's many other report-producing organizations, strive to put on personal or collective briefings for their intended audiences. Critics of OTA contend that its weighty tomes don't meet the needs of Congress; OTA aficionados respond that OTA's research and reports enrich and enlighten the legislative process in ways that defy measurement.

Whatever the problems of prolixity, OTA's independence, non-partisanship, thoroughness and high-quality scholarship are not in dispute. During the Reagan Administration, Republicans jumped on OTA because of a report that echoed doubts about the technological feasibility of the Strategic Defense Initiative. But with minor exceptions, OTA has otherwise avoided partisan controversy and taken root as a fixture on Capitol Hill.

Presiding over OTA is a 12-member Congressional Board, equally divided between House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans. As a safeguard against resources being scattered on innumerable assignments from individual members of Congress, OTA confines itself to topics assigned by Congressional committees, which means that OTA works mainly for committee chairmen.

Among other benefits, it is thus shielded from composing term papers for the offspring of influential constituents—a chore not unknown on Capitol Hill. And to guard against venturing into politically troublesome territory, OTA's workload must pass muster by its politically balanced Congressional Board. But the prominence of committee chairmen and the Board in OTA's affairs has left it pretty much unknown among the rank and file of Congress—a liability now that OTA needs to mobilize support.

Another layer of insulation against political tampering is

*(Continued on Page 5)*



## ... OTA's Democratic Connections Chills the GOP

(Continued from Page 4)

provided by a standing Technology Assessment Advisory Council, mainly drawn from academe and industry. Currently chaired by Neil E. Harl of Iowa State University, the Council members include Lewis M. Branscomb, Harvard; Joshua Lederberg, Rockefeller University, and Max Lennon, President and CEO, Eastern Foods, Inc., Atlanta. For each study it conducts, OTA seeks guidance from panels of outside specialists, though the actual sorting out of information and report writing are performed by the OTA staff.

With 20 years of experience, OTA has mastered the difficulties of producing studies acceptable to customers with widely differing politics. Admiring parliamentarians come from abroad to study its operations. But none of OTA's many attributes can overcome the Republican perception that it is a stronghold of the *ancien regime*. Among the many accusations leveled at OTA is that it's a dumping ground for Kennedy proteges as well as those of another despised Democrat, Rep. John Dingell, who's also on the OTA Board. Not so, say OTA backers, but the charges persist.

For other reasons, however, recent history reinforces Republican suspicions of OTA. The architect of OTA as it now exists was Presidential Science Advisor John Gibbons. Gibbons signed on as Director of OTA in 1979 after the organization went through a faltering startup period that put its survival in doubt. Seen as a last-try Director, Gibbons made OTA work, and in the process formed close relationships with several members of Congress, including Rep. and later Senator Al Gore.

### To the Editor:

In SGR [Nov. 15, "HHS Commission on Research Integrity Plods On"], my testimony before the Commission on Research Integrity was misrepresented. "What are scientific misdeeds?" That is the issue! Doubtless you will recall my "eloquent" argument for a tight definition of misconduct in science as fabrication, falsification and plagiarism. I pointed out that *all* cases adjudicated thus far by the Office of Research Integrity [ORI] are covered by those three "misdeeds." My record is clear in supporting efforts to investigate and adjudicate charges related to such "misdeeds," followed by imposition of tough sanctions when guilt is established.

By consulting your notes or listening to your tape you will find that I referred to a case reported in the *Federal Register* involving a member of the National Academy of Sciences. He was guilty of plagiarism, and I pointed out that the sanction (or punishment) imposed by ORI was ridiculous. "He would not be allowed to serve on a study section." Some punishment! I do object to governmental efforts, oppressive or not, that deal with style and behavior of scientists unless they are involved in fabrication, falsification or plagiarism.

My position was further misrepresented by SGR. In the discussion on intent, I made it clear that I side with [Commission Member Kristina] Gunsalus [Associate Vice Chancellor

On Gore's recommendation, Gibbons was appointed to the White House S&T post, and brought along several senior staff members from OTA. Gibbons' successor as OTA Director was an old hand at the agency, Roger Herdman, a physician who headed OTA's health-policy program.

Gore was initially designated by Clinton to serve as a kind of technology czar in the Administration, and in that role—now eclipsed by other duties—Gore and Gibbons worked closely and still do. In fact, Gibbons last week accompanied Gore on a trip to Russia.

History thus has put a Democratic flavor, if not taint, on OTA, despite a record that's free of political partisanship. But it's understandable that the Republicans are suspicious of OTA, perhaps even paranoid. Their attitude was surely reinforced by one of the first public reactions to the kill plan, an appeal for a reprieve for OTA and GAO from Ralph Nader to the Republican chiefs on Capitol Hill, Senator Bob Dole and Rep. Newt Gingrich.

In a letter released to the press, Nader lectured them that they need the two agencies to look out for misdeeds in the Executive Branch, adding, "This is especially true if you are going to cut staff of the more prevailing Committees of inquiry into the federal agencies and departments."

It is doubtful that the rampaging Republicans will be swayed by that observation. OTA can be rescued only if legislators who recognize its merit rally around. The dynamics of the new Congress are too uncertain to allow for confident forecasts. What is certain is that if OTA is dismembered, it will be difficult to put it back together again.—DSG

for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign]. First investigate and uncover the facts. For example, was there fabrication or falsification? In other cases, was there plagiarism? No questions about the verdict. I also indicated that it was unlikely that a person could falsify or fabricate without intending to. With regard to plagiarism, I did not, as you claim, state "but plagiarism, he insisted, could be unintentional." Indeed, I disagree with my colleague [Samuel] Silverstein [Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons] who was in fact the speaker who used the phrase "unintentional plagiarism." My comments focused on a tough, broad definition of plagiarism as "misappropriation of intellectual property."

In summary, my views were misrepresented twice in a very inadequate coverage of what I said. How you could give such short shrift to my pearls of wisdom and pay so much attention to that glib, self-righteous misinterpretation of scientific pursuit that was pandered by ["whistle-blower witnesses" Suzanne] Hadley, [Walter] Stewart, and [Ned] Feder escapes me.

**Howard K. Schachman**

Prof. of Biochem. & Molecular Biology  
Univ. of California, Berkeley; and  
roving ombudsman for the Director of NIH

## Two Big Studies Surveying Role, Health of R&D

Two major studies of national research policy—one under way, the other soon to begin—take on special significance as Republicans and Democrats compete in promises of budget carnage.

The Council on Competitiveness, Washington outpost of high-tech industry, major research universities, and assorted relations, is at about the halfway mark on a two-year study titled "Reinventing R&D: New Relationships and Trends in Managing Research and Development."

Meanwhile, the National Academy of Sciences will soon begin a one-year, Congressionally mandated and financed study of the federal R&D enterprise, with emphasis on the adequacy of support for biomedical research. The study will be conducted by the tentatively titled "Committee on Criteria for Federal Support of R&D."

Introspection and outside examination of the vital signs of science are never absent from the capital city, where cadres of staff specialists are poised to collect data and compose reports at the drop of a grant. But the two ventures are on a grander scale than is usually the case. And their potential importance is enhanced by the chilled political atmosphere.

The Council on Competitiveness study possesses heavy-weight leadership from business and academe, starting with co-Chairs Gary Tooker, CEO of Motorola, and Frank Rhodes, recently retired President of Cornell University and current Chairman of the National Science Board, policymaking body of the National Science Foundation. There's also an advisory council of 55 "key R&D executives," according to an outline from the Council. The crucial role of staff chief for the Council's study is filled by David Gunston.

A key figure is former NSF Director Erich Bloch, a Distinguished Fellow at the Council, who is described as playing a "leadership role" in the study. Bloch's view of Clinton technology policy is that it's on the right track, but isn't moving fast enough, whereas the prevailing theme among incoming House Republicans is that government should leave commercial technology development to the marketplace.

The Council has consistently supported a Clinton favorite that's a prime Republican target, the rapidly expanded Advanced Technology Program (ATP) at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. A federal-industrial partnership program for developing commercial technologies, ATP was listed for abolition in an addendum to the Contract With America prepared by the Republican minority on the House Budget Committee [SGR, November 15].

One of the stated goals of the Council's study is "Recommending actions to companies, universities, states and the Federal government to strengthen the R&D base in ways that support US competitiveness. Particularly important among these activities," the Council states, "will be an assessment of how other nations are changing their management of R&D."

Preparation of a series of "sectoral reports," with a final report scheduled for completion by the end of 1995, will be

assisted by working groups representing industry, government, labor, and universities, according to the Council's timetable.

The other big study, scheduled to start in January at the National Academy of Sciences, will examine whether federal research policy "is designed to meet new national security concerns, military, economic, and health, that confront our Nation in a post-cold war world," according to its Congressional mandate.

The Chairman of the study is Frank Press, a fellow at the Carnegie Institution of Washington since retiring last year from the presidency of the Academy. Press will head a committee of some 18 members, to be announced next month. SGR hears that, in addition to the regulars who show up on such bodies of inquiry, some "younger people" will be included.

The Academy study was ordered in the fiscal 1995 report of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, released last July. The report earmarked \$750,000 in the budget of the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health for delivery to the Academy for conduct of the study.

The Academy, of course, is strongly opposed to earmarked funding, and in favor of competitive review for federally financed research, but has not protested the award.

Though the specifications for the study by the Academy are broad, the genesis of this venture is doubt about the adequacy of federal biomedical-research funding. The Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Tom Harkin (D-Iowa), has expressed concern on this topic for several years, in bi-partisan tandem with the senior Republican on the Subcommittee, Senator Mark Hatfield, of Oregon. Hatfield moves up to chairmanship of the full Appropriations Committee in the next Congress.

The money has already been delivered to the Academy, and thus the project is safe from cut-backs that are being discussed in appropriations for the present fiscal year.

Norman Metzger of the Academy staff will serve as Study Director and Robert Cook-Deegan of the Institute of Medicine as Senior Program Officer.

### FASEB Seeks NIH Boost

Seemingly oblivious of the election returns and the ensuing bipartisan stampede to cut federal spending, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology has come out again with recommendations for large increases in government support of biomedical research. Released December 15, the hallucinatory figures were composed at a consensus conference of FASEB, which numbers some 42,000 members in 10 life science societies. Next year, says the report, the NIH budget should rise by 10 percent. Fat chance.

For copies of the report of the Consensus Conference: FASEB, OPAR, 9650 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Md. 20814; tel. 301/571-0657; fax 571-0686.

## In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

**From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:**  
**Management Reform: Implementation of the National Performance Review[NPR]'s Recommendations** (GAO/OCG-95-1; 539 pp.), from Congress's investigative agency, a weighty but not particularly illuminating report on progress as of last September toward the Clinton Administration's plans for "reinventing government," for which the guidebook is *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less*, issued in September 1993 under the imprint of Vice President Al Gore, and widely available in bookstores.

In summarizing the results of its inquiry, the GAO states, "Some progress has been made in implementing many of the NPR recommendations since September 1993, but few have been fully implemented. A number of the recommendations will take years to fully implement." Noting White House estimates of 71,000 federal jobs wiped out in fiscal 1994, with many thousands more to go, the GAO says it is "concerned about whether agencies have the processes, systems, and qualified staff needed to perform their current missions, let alone take on the additional responsibilities NPR envisions in a downsized, decentralized, and deregulated environment."

The GAO report includes sections on all the major federal research agencies, but the discussions are skimpy and usually come down to a finding that amounts to "too early to tell." Ironically, the GAO itself faces the budget ax in the next Congress, following a vote by the Senate Republican conference to cut \$200 million from the legislative budget, including 25 percent from the GAO's \$450 million budget.

**Highway Safety: Factors Affecting Involvement in Vehicle Crashes** (GAO/PEMD-95-3; 46 pp.), looks at the question of whether lighter vehicles are more likely to be involved in highway collisions, and concludes that age, sex, and driver history are by far the greatest risk factors.

The report is a followup to a 1991 GAO study, *Highway Safety: Have Automobile Weight Reductions Increased Highway Fatalities* (GAO/PEMD-92-1), which concluded that the forecasts of a higher injury rate from lighter cars were overstated. Behind the weight issue is Detroit's resistance to federal fuel-efficiency mandates, which put a premium on lighter cars, which tend to be less expensive and therefore less profitable for the manufacturers and dealers. The industry has responded with the contention that lighter vehicles are susceptible to more collisions and worse injuries.

The GAO study was requested by Senators Ernest Hollings (D-SC), Chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and Richard Bryan (D-Nev.), Chairman of its Consumer Subcommittee. With both stepping down from their chairs, and deregulation a major theme of the new Republican majorities, automotive safety is destined to rank low on the Congressional agenda.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

**From the Federation of American Scientists (FAS):**

**Secrecy & Government Bulletin** (monthly, two pages; \$20 per year; free to libraries open to the public), virtually alone in monitoring government secrecy, this publication maintains a hawk-eye watch on federal classification policies and practices, with regular reports on the Clinton Administration's off-and-on progress toward fulfillment of pledges to unlock the Cold War files. The December issue reports that the next big declassification item on the White House agenda concerns decades of satellite and aerial imagery, much of it considered valuable for environmental and other research purposes. Executive orders governing release of the material have been drafted, the *Bulletin* reports, and have been at the National Security Council "for months awaiting action." The report, published since 1991, is written by Steven Aftergood, of the FAS, founded at the end of World War II to give scientists a voice in atomic policy and other science-related issues.

Order from: Federation of American Scientists, 307 Massachusetts Ave. NE, Washington, DC 20002; tel. 202/675-1012; fax 202/675-1010; e-mail [saftergood@igc.apc.org](mailto:saftergood@igc.apc.org)

**Chemical Heritage** (twice a year, 32 pages; US, no charge for individuals; libraries and foreign subscriptions, \$25), reports on the history of chemistry and chemical engineering, related scholarly activities, meetings, publications, etc. In magazine format, the publication is produced by the Chemical Heritage Foundation, established by the American Chemical Society and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers. Prior to 1993, the publication was titled the *Beckman Center News*, and before that, *CHOC*, for the Center for the History of Chemistry.

Order from: Chemical Heritage, attn. Laurel Adelman, 3401 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-6228; tel. 215/898-0082; fax 215/898-3327.

### To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
 Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
 Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$455.00 ☐  
 two years, \$780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface  
 mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970  
 In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

# In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

## From the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS):

**Congressional Action on Research and Development in the FY 1995 Budget** (76 pp., \$8.50 for AAAS members; \$10.95 for others), latest in the annual AAAS series providing, agency by agency, tables and text on the R&D budget proposals that the White House sent to Congress last February for the fiscal year that began October 1. With few exceptions, the R&D enterprise remains in the fiscal doldrums, along with most other items in the discretionary, or politically squeezable, portion of the federal budget. The federal R&D total remains huge, \$72.7 billion, of which some \$14 billion is categorized as basic research. But in real terms, most agencies and programs have been gasping from little or no growth for several years. The big exception is the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which runs the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), a Clinton favorite for boosting industry. Up from \$188 million last year to \$356 million this year, ATP is the growth champion in the federal R&D portfolio, though it's still a mere sliver of the R&D pie. But the new Republican majority in Congress is talking about reopening the current budget for shrinkage. ATP is high on the kill list, damned as an unwholesome intrusion of federal money, power, and bureaucrats into the supposedly wise workings of the marketplace.

Order from: AAAS Distribution Center, Post Office Box 521, Annapolis Junction, Md. 20701; tel. 1-800/222-7809; fax 301/206-9789.

## From the National Academy of Sciences (NAS):

**National Science Education Standards** (376 pp., no charge), in the crowded field of science-education improvement, this is the product of one of the biggest and most ambitious efforts to reconceptualize teaching and learning about science. The emphasis is on fundamental principles of scientific method, plus some basic facts, rather than memorization of myriad details, with levels of understanding stated for grades 4, 8, and 12. Undertaken by the Academy as part of the national movement toward adoption of voluntary standards for many academic subjects, the project was supported by NSF, NIH, NASA, and the US Department of Education at a cost of \$6.5 million over three years. The present document is a draft version for which comments, on a form enclosed with the volume, are invited, by February 28, from anyone interested. The final version is scheduled for publication late in 1995.

Order from: National Academy of Sciences, National Science Education Standards Project, Room HA-486, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-1399; fax 202/334-1294.

## From the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST):

**Challenges Confronting Agricultural Research at Land Grant Colleges** (12 pp., \$3), an "issue paper" reviewing recent conferences and other introspections concerning the State Agriculture Experiment Stations (SAES) system, under criticism and financial pressures from multiple quarters as a scientific laggard as well as increasingly irrelevant to the farm economy. But there's hope, if the SAES catches up with modern times, according to the authors, James Fisher, of the South Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Clemson University, and James J. Zuiches, of the Agricultural Research Center, Washington State University (currently at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan). Noting that "the insular nature of the agricultural research community may be an obstacle to meaningful change," the paper urges the SAES "to forge links and partnerships with groups traditionally outside the system"—including industry, other academic disciplines, and consumer groups. But citing past rumblings from Congress, the authors caution that "the SAES system must recognize that developing too close a relationship with the private sector could cause Land Grant universities to lose their credibility with society." A broadly based panel of agricultural specialists reviewed the paper for CAST, a non-profit association of some 30 scientific, educational, and business organizations.

Order from: Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, 4420 West Lincoln Way, Ames, Iowa 50014-3447; tel. 515/292-2125; fax 515/292-4512.

## From the National Academy of Sciences (NAS):

**Investing in Research: A National Research Initiative Update** (78 pp., \$20), by the NAS Board on Agriculture, a review of the US Department of Agriculture's competitive-grants program, founded in 1979 with the advice of the Academy in response to complaints about the backward state of science in USDA-supported research. Though a proposed fast climb to a \$500-million-a-year budget was accepted by the Bush and Clinton Administrations, the program, since renamed the National Research Initiative on Agriculture, Food, and the Environment, has lingered around the \$100 million mark for years because of Congressional affection for the old block-funding ways of ag research. The "update" refers to a still-available 1989 NAS report, *Investing in Research: A Proposal to Strengthen the Agricultural, Food, and Environmental System* (168 pp., \$20. Add \$4 for shipping per volume, or the two are for available \$34 plus \$4.)

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Lockbox 285, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 1-800-624-6242; in the Washington-DC area: 202/334-3313.

(Continued on Page 7)

## SGR Holiday Schedule

The next issue of *Science & Government Report* will be published January 15, 1995, commencing SGR's 25th year of publication.



